

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINAP-2007
USDC CLEARED AND INDEXED - 11/19/2007

2007 NOV 19 P 2 50

Edward Wilkins, # 244908, aka Edward Earl Wilkins) C/A No. 2:07-3432-GRA-RSC
)
)
Plaintiff,)
) REPORT AND
vs.) RECOMMENDATION
)
Department of Correction; Medical Dept. of Corrections; and State of SC,)
)
Defendants.)
)

The plaintiff, Edward Wilkins ("Plaintiff"), proceeding *pro se*, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.¹ Plaintiff is an inmate at Evans Correctional Institution, a facility of the South Carolina Department of Corrections ("SCDC"), and files this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The complaint names SCDC, the State of South Carolina and "Medical Department of Corrections" as defendants.² Plaintiff claims he was injured while handcuffs were taken off his wrist with a "bolt cutter," and he claims lack of adequate medical care. The complaint seeks monetary damages and injunctive relief in the form of medical care.

¹ Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

² Title 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (a) requires review of a "complaint in a civil action in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity."

Pro Se and In Forma Pauperis Review

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915; 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; and the Prison Litigation Reform Act, Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996). This review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995) (*en banc*); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983).

The complaint herein has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action "fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted" or is "frivolous or malicious." § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint "lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. at 31. Hence, under § 1915(e)(2)(B), a claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte*. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Allison v. Kyle*, 66 F.3d 71 (5th Cir. 1995).

This Court is required to liberally construe *pro se* documents, *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 9 (1980) (*per curiam*). Even under this less stringent standard, however, the *pro se* complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The mandated liberal construction afforded to *pro se* pleadings means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a petition to include claims that were never presented, *Barnett v. Hargett*, 174 F.3d 1128, 1133 (10th Cir. 1999), or construct the plaintiff's legal arguments for him, *Small v. Endicott*, 998 F.2d 411, 417-18 (7th Cir. 1993), or "conjure up questions never squarely presented" to the court, *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985). The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the Court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. See *Weller v. Department of Social Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

Discussion

The complaint is filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which "'is not itself a source of substantive rights,' but merely provides 'a method for vindicating federal rights elsewhere conferred.'" *Albright v. Oliver*, 510 U.S. 266, 271 (1994), quoting

Baker v. McCollan, 443 U.S. 137, 144, n. 3 (1979). A legal action under § 1983 allows "a party who has been deprived of a federal right under the color of state law to seek relief." *City of Monterey v. Del Monte Dunes at Monterey, Ltd.*, 526 U.S. 687, 707 (1999). To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

The complaint names SCDC, the State of South Carolina and "Medical Department of Corrections" as defendants in the caption of the complaint.³ The complaint, however, makes no specific factual allegations against these named defendants. Although the complaint makes specific allegations of physical injury to Plaintiff's wrist and inadequate medical care, the complaint does not name the individuals, "the persons acting under color of state law," involved in the alleged constitutional violations. The complaint must "contain a modicum of factual specificity, identifying the particular conduct of defendants that is alleged to have harmed the

³ The complaint on page two lists only "officers at bus depo" as defendants, with a place of employment "at the transportation bus depo at Broad River Road." Compl. at 2. Although unknown persons can initially be included in a complaint, this designation is insufficient to provide necessary information to identify an individual, or even an entity that can identify the individual, that can be served with process. Thus, the "officers at bus depo" have not been named as defendants in this case.

plaintiff." *Ross v. Meagan*, 638 F.2d 646, 650 (3d Cir. 1981). The complaint fails to identify the conduct of Defendant SCDC, Defendant State of South Carolina and Defendant "Medical Department of Corrections" that is claimed to have harmed Plaintiff. Thus, the complaint fails to state a claim against these defendants and Plaintiff is not entitled to the relief requested.

Additionally, these defendants are immune from a § 1983 action. The Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution divests this court of jurisdiction to entertain a suit brought against the State of South Carolina or its integral parts, such as a state agency or department. *Kimel v. Florida Board of Regents*, 528 U.S. 62 (2000); *Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida*, 517 U.S. 44, 58 (1996) (Eleventh Amendment bars suit directly against state or its agencies, regardless of nature of relief sought). The Eleventh Amendment provides:

The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.

See *Pennhurst State School & Hospital v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89 (1984) (although express language of Eleventh Amendment only forbids suits by citizens of other States against a State, Eleventh Amendment bars suits against a State filed by its own citizens). Under *Pennhurst State School & Hospital v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. at 99 & n. 9, a State must expressly consent to suit in a federal

district court. The State of South Carolina has not consented to suit in a federal court. See South Carolina Tort Claims Act, § 15-78-20(e), South Carolina Code of Laws (statute expressly provides that the State of South Carolina does not waive Eleventh Amendment immunity, consents to suit only in a court of the State of South Carolina, and does not consent to suit in a federal court or in a court of another State). The defendants State of South Carolina, SCDC, and "Medical Dept. of Corrections" have Eleventh Amendment immunity from Plaintiff's claims. This § 1983 complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted against the named immune defendants. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) (2) (B).

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Judge dismiss the complaint in this case without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915A [as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal]. The plaintiff's attention is directed to the notice on the following page.


Robert S. Carr
United States Magistrate Judge

November 19, 2007
Charleston, South Carolina

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
P. O. Box 835
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).